Meeting was called to order by Matt Root and we approved Minutes from January 28.

Matt reviewed the Committee’s recommendations on sustainability with the group. This was the primary topic of the meeting and what follows are the highlights of the discussion.

We are not seeking a Green Certification and this language in the goals was softened.

The Committee reviewed and endorsed the high-level goals which are directed at the key areas over which the Committee has influence and control. Matt clarified the position of the Committee to avoid taking on the additional budget to capitalize the solar/storage aspects of the project and reiterated that this is beyond the scope of the budget and the project. The Committee will complete the solar ready aspects of the project but the generation and storage are in the jurisdiction of the CMLP and the Town, not the Building Committee.

Laurie Hunter indicated that we could be more explicit in our language on the goal for Zero Energy and Solar and some modifications were made to the document to that end.

Ian Parks made the recommendation to include the generation and storage as an ‘Add’ in the estimation process however Kate made the point that the CMLP would prefer to handle the costing and we agreed as a group to defer to the CMLP and wait to see how it plays-out.

Matt introduced the EZ Code as the best vehicle for defining a concise set of metrics for the project and also indicated that SMMA was supportive of this direction. There are three EZ Code paths and the Prescriptive Path is recommended, with the exception of the Solar Generation paragraphs and several others which are not relevant to the project (the document points to the various sections that are included in the recommendation.)

Matt followed with a review of a short-list of metrics from the EZ Code. The only discussion point was on the window-to-wall-ratio and the relationship to the type of fenestration: as the amount of fenestration increases, the energy attributes of the windows becomes more stringent.

EV charging was discussed via the EZ Code requirement vs. the LEED requirement, i.e. 10% in EZ vs. 2% in LEED. This issue was deferred to a later point when we have clearer cost and budget information.

Kate Hanley made the point that the recommendation needed to be more explicit as to which pieces are excluded vs. which are recommended. Matt agreed to add clarity in the document.
Kristen Olsen made the point that SMMA was supportive of the EZ Code approach as long as we agree that it’s a framework and that we can continue to review and analyze these goals as the project evolves. Matt added that we need to pick targets and start to move forward with those targets. If we find there is an issue or a conflict, we can always have a discussion and make tweaks if necessary but that we need a set of targets to get started.

Martine and Kristen had questions about the daylighting metrics. The concerns were discussed but we did not pursue making changes to the percentages. Matt indicated that his initial reaction is to leave the recommendation as is with the understanding that we can come back to it at a later date.

Laurie brought up the issues of shading and glare as a problem in other schools in Town. Charlie Parker indicated that we have another section of the recommendation that calls-out shading and glare as a next step to be considered and investigated.

David Bearg offered citizen comments that he would like to volunteer to help the Committee with ventilation and passive solar strategies. Matt indicated that we would like to invite him to a Sub-Committee meeting where we could discuss his ideas. The Committee has had discussions on displacement ventilation in the past and David’s help is welcome.

Jerry Frenkil reiterated the point that we need to be more explicit as to our commitment as a Town to build a Zero Energy Building.

Committee voted unanimously to present the recommendations to the CMSBC for their final approval.